DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 381 CG 007 798

AUTHOR Riedel, Marc; Thew, Karen
TITLE Interpersonal Attraction and Machiavellianism: A Study of Roommate Pairs.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at 1972 American Sociological Association Convention (New Orleans, Louisiana, August 28-31, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; College Students; Females; Human Relations; *Interpersonal Relationship; Perception; *Personality; Personality Theories; Research Projects; *Social Background; *Social Relations; *Values
IDENTIFIERS Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values; College Student Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

The study attempts to test hypotheses derived from the model of interpersonal attraction suggested by Kerckhoff and Davis, who investigated the issue of need complementarity versus similarity in their longitudinal research upon couples who were engaged or otherwise seriously attached and who proposed that homogamy in social attributes is instrumental in the early stages of the relationship, then value-consensus, and finally, need complementarity. The current study introduces a personality variable, Machiavellianism, which can differentiate between the proposals of Kerckhoff and Davis and those made in other research and which is also essential to evaluation of the former's model. The subjects sampled were well established female college roommate pairs. Age, year in college, and major field of study were used to determine similarity in social attributes. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values and the College Student Questionnaire were selected in order to ascertain degree of value-consensus and also to assess accuracy of perception and assumed similarity. The Mach Scales were employed to indicate complementarity and to relate personality to perception data. Results are discussed in relation to the Kerckhoff and Davis formulation and to Machiavellianism. (Author/SES)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073381

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION AND MACHIAVELLIANISM

A STUDY OF ROOMMATE PAIRS*

MARC RIEDEL KAREN THEW

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 198

* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, August 30, 1972.

Introduction

The issues of need complementarity versus similarity has been a focal concern of research on the phenomenon of interpersonal attraction. Major variables, subjects, instruments, and methodology range widely in this group of studies. In general, researchers have attempted to delineate the effects of three major variables which contribute to the development of attraction in a dyad: firstly, social attributes (homogamy in social status, religion, race, age, intelligence, ethnic background, and previous marital status); secondly, values and attitudes; and thirdly, personality variables. Subjects who have been considered include for example, roommates, friends, or couples who were going steady, were engaged, or were married. Despite such variation, the majority of these studies support some form of similarity as the basis for interpersonal attraction. The evidence pertaining to homogamy in social background factors rather conclusively documents its existence.[1] The results obtained in relation to attitudinal similarity are equally compelling.[2] Investigations of similarity in personality traits have likewise produced positive correlations.[3] However, as Berscheld and Walster note,

> ...positive correlations have not been obtained between personality traits and attraction with the great regularity with which positive correlations between attitudinal similarity and attraction have been found. In addition, positive personality correlations are usually much lower than attitudinal correlations.... This body of correlation data, then, prompts one to speculate that if personality similarity <u>is</u> a factor in attraction, it is perhaps a less important one than attitudinal similarity.[4]

Efforts to demonstrate that need complementarity is the

basis of interpersonal attraction have been far from conclusive. Early studies have supported Winch's theory of complimentary needs,[5] but subsequent work has failed to confirm the primary role of need complementarity in attraction.[6] Possible explanations for the negative findings have been advanced by others, thus further contributing to the controversy.

The work of Kerckhoff and Davis[8] was not only innovative, but also particularly relevant to the debate. On the basis of their findings, they suggested that all three factors listed above are operative in the development of attraction, but at different stages of courtship. During a seven-month period, the researchers collected data from college couples who were pinned, engaged, or "seriously attached." Their purpose was to examine the relationship between measures of attitudinal value-consensus and need complementarity and progress in the mate selection process.

They hypothesized that progress toward permanent union might be positively related to both the degree of value-consensus and need complementarity. Value-consensus was measured by asking subjects if their relationships had changed in the past seven months. They could choose from three possible responses: "Yes, we are farther from being a permanent couple;" "No, it is the same;" "Yes, we are nearer to being a permanent couple." The degree of value-consensus was determined by means of the Farber Family Value Index; and the degree of need complimentarity was assessed by menas of the FIRO-B scales for inclusion, control, and affection. Correlations were then computed between the independent variables (need complimentarity and value-con-

sensus) and the dependent variable (progress toward permanence). The sample was divided into "long-term" and "short-term" couples. At the inception of the research, the former were classified as those who had maintained their relationships for eighteen months or more; and the latter were classified as those who had done so for less than eighteen months.

The hypothesized relationships between the independent variables were neither definitely confirmed nor refuted by analysis of the data. For the total sample, only value-consensus was significantly related to progress toward permanence. A critical factor in the relationship obtained between the independent and dependent variables was the length of time the couples had been going together. Thus, the relationship between value-consensus and progress occurred only for short-term couples. None of the three measures of complementarity was significantly correlated with progress among these couples. In the case of long-term couples, two of the measures (inclusion and control) produced a significant relationship. Even though the affect dimension did not achieve significance, it was in the predicted direction. No relationship between value-consensus and progress was evident for long-term couples.

Their results enabled the investigators to develop a series of hypotheses concerning the interrelationships of the three variables. Homogamy in social attributes, value-consensus, and need complementarity are incorporated in a gradual"filtering" process of attraction, which operates in mate selection. In the case of long-term couples in the sample, homogamous social attributes serve to delimit the field of eligibles in the early

stages of the realtionship; somewhat later, value-consensus appears to become a determinant of whether or not the relationship will continue; and finally, relatively late in the relationship, need complementarity emerges as a relevant consideration. Kerckhoff and Davis explain that the "filtering" actions of need complementarity were not noticeable until the later stages of courtship due to the prior (unrealistic) idealization of the partner, which would preclude its emergence. They believe that need complementarity was not found in previous research because it appears to emerge in later stages of courtship. Therefore, they suggest that it should be demonstrable with a more extensive longitudinal design.

The present study attempts to test hypotheses derived from the Kerckhoff and Davis model. The subjects are twenty-one female roommate pairs who have voluntarily maintained their relationships during three or more consecutive semesters. The fact that they have roomed together for a minimum of eighteen months (prior to data collection) permits them to be designated as "long-term" couples, in accordance with the Kerckhoff and Davis criterion. Applying their formulation, it is anticipated that these roommate pairs will manifest a significant degree of similarity in social background factors, and a significant amount of value-consensus, as well as need complementarity.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant positive relationship between members on the social background variables of age, year in college, and major.

Hypothesis 2: Pair members will exhibit a significant amount of attitude and value-consensus, as indicated by:

a. a significant positive relationship between pair members on each of the subscales (theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious) of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values; and

b. a significant positive relationship between pair members on each of the subscales (family independence, peer independence, social conscience, and liberalism) of the College Student Questionnaire.

A central feature of the Kerckhoff and Davis explanation is the juxtaposition of the "idealized version of the other" in the early stages of the relationship and the increasing accuracy of perception of the other somewhat later. It is the latter which they assume to necessarily precede the emergence of need complementarity. In contrast to their assumption that accuracy of perception is associated with need complementarity, there is evidence[9] that people who are attracted to one another perceive themselves as being more similar than they actually are. In those studies which have compared the amount of actual similarity to the amount of perceived similarity, the results demonstrate that people tend to overestimate the extent to which others to whom they are attracted share their views. Newcomb,[10] who used male roommate pairs as subjects, found that perceived similarity was more critical to interpersonal attraction than the accurate perception of actual similarity. It would seem, then, that there are two types of perceived similarity which may be related to attraction; that which is accurate (accuracy of perception) and that which is inaccurate (assumed similarity).

The nature of the realtionship between these two types of perceived similarity and interpersonal attraction is rather complex. The implication of these studies is that both types of perception contribute to interpersonal attraction, but that assumed similarity is more important. If this be the case, then, according to the Kerckhoff and Davis paradigm, need complimentarity would not be evident until the "idealized" version of the other" were replaced by a more realistic assessment of the other. In other words, one would expect need complementarity in association with accuracy of perception, but not with assumed similarity. This in turn raises the problem of the differential distribution among individuals of the ability to perceive accurately, as well as the tendency to assume unwarranted similarity. One cannot assume that both members of a dyad will possess these traits to the same extent. If this were true, one would predict that the dyad characterized by accuracy of perception would also be characterized by need complementarity, and that the dyad typified by assumed similarity would not be. Unfortunately, the Kerckhoff and Davis formulation does not account for the dyad in which both members do not possess these traits consistently.

In order to clarify the nature of the relationship between perception and personality, insofar as both of these affect interpersonal attraction, The Mach Scales[11] were administered to the present sample. They measure the degree to which one is means-end oriented. It has been found that scores on the instrument are significantly related to manipulative behavior.

In addition, an essential difference between high and low scorers is the greater emotional detachment of the former.[12] One reason for using the Mach Scales is related to the crutial roles of assumed similarity and accuracy of perception in determining interpersonal attraction, as outlined above. A personality variable which successfully differentiates among individuals according to their tendencies to assume unwarranted similarity and their abilities to perceive accurately would be most useful in this context. Previous research[13] has clearly demonstrated that high Machs perceive more accurately and tend to assume less similarity than do low Machs. Consistent with past findings, it is expected that high Mach scorers will perceive more accurately and assume less similarity than do low Mach scorers.

Hypothesis 3: High Mach scorers will perceive significantly more accurately than the low Mach scorers.

Hypothesis 4: High Mach scorers will tend to assume significantly less similarity than the low Mach scorers.

One critic[14] has pointed out that need complementarity hypothesis would more likely be confirmed if it were examined in the context of a more global personality type, rather than in terms of specific and discrete personality needs, as has been the case in past research. Other researchers[15] who have employed such an approach have obtained confirmatory results. Machiavellianism, then, may be accepted as a reasonable indicator in this context.

Application of the Kerckhoff and Davis model would further predict that all roommate pairs will be complementary in per-

sonality, i.e., composed of one high scorer and one low scorer on the Mach Scales. Another reason for using the Mach Scales comes from some indirect evidence for the complementarity hypothesis supplied by Geis, et al.[16] In their pilot study on Machiavellians, subjects were unanimously attracted to partners who were described as "different" from themselves. Thus, it is also expected that these roommate pairs will be predominantly complementary in composition.

Hypothesis 5: The number of complementary roommate pairs will be significantly greater than that of similar roommate pairs (in which both members are either high or low Machs).

Method

The data was gathered at the University of Delaware during the spring semester of 1968. Since the vast majority of female students resided in campus dormatories, the Housing Office was able to provide lists of female students living in University housing, the names of their roommates, and information as to how long each pair of roommates had lived together. At the end of the academic year, the Housing Office circulated forms among the residents, requesting their roommate choices for the following year. This constituted the best opportunity for making changes. The Housing Office followed the policy of allowing girls who chose one another to room together, or to remain together of they were already roommates. Changes were possible at any time by petitioning the Housing Office.

In order to be included in the sample, roommate pairs had to have roomed together for three or more semesters. From a

list of these pairs, a random sample was drawn.

Data were collected from all the subjects by the same female investigator who met with the roommate pairs in their dormatory tooms during evening hours. The girls were told that they were participating in a study to determine compatibility in roommates. After each pair had indicated their willingness to participate, they were separated and taken to different rooms where they completed the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the College Student Questionnaire, and the Mach Scales. Subjects were asked to indicate their attitudes on the College Student Questionnaire (Form I) and also to attempt to predict the responses their roommates would make to the same items (Form II).

Using the standard techniques, scores were derived for each of the tests. Data from the College Student Questionnaire were also used to obtain measures of accuracy of perception, actual similarity, and assumed similarity.

There were two pairs who were unable to complete the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values because of meetings they had to attend. They were, however, able to complete the remainder of the test battery.

Results

Description of Sample

Whether a pair member is labelled "pair member #1" or "pair member #2" is purely arbitrary, and therefore, the descriptive data is presented for the total sample of forty-two subjects.

Table I provides the means and standard deviations for the social background variables of age and year in college.

TABLE I

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF AGE AND YEAR IN COLLEGE
(N=42)

	AGE	YEAR IN COLLEGE
MEAN	20.5	3.2
S.D.	.80	.73

As Table I indicates, the subjects were very similar to one another with regard to age and year in college. Thirty-four of the forty-two subjects were between the ages of twenty and twenty-one and were also either juniors or seniors. There were no freshmen and only eight sophomores in the sample.

The method of selecting the sample restricted the possible variation in age and year in college. Due to the stipulation that members of a pair be roommates for three or more consecutive semesters, all members of the sample would have to be at least second-semester sophomores. The selection requirement likewise increased the probability that any given subject would be at least nineteen years of age.

Since there is little variation in the sample, the pairs in turn reflect very little variation in age and year in college. Thus, the highly significant relationships between pair members on age and year in co-lege obtained in subsequent analysis result from the limited amount of variation possible. These relationships do not, therefore, constitute adequate proof of similarity in social background variables, as used in the Kerckhoff and Davis research.

College major was the best available indicator of similarity between pair members in social background factors. The object-

ive criterion used for primary analysis of the distribution of majors in the sample was academic department, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' MAJORS BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT (N=42)

# IN MAJOR	DECLARED MAJOR	# IN MAJOR	DECLARED MAJOR
1	Art	1	Math
1	Biology	1	Medical Technology
1	Child Development	3	Nursing
19	Education	1	Sociology
3	English	1	Statistics and Computer Science
1	German	1	Textiles and Clothing
1	Home Economics	2	Unreported
1	International Relations		

Thus far, the results obtained for the entire sample in the social background variables of age, year in college, and major have been reported. The findings derived from the attitude and personality scales for the total sample have also been analyzed.

Two pairs of subjects were unable to complete the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. Table III provides the means and standard deviations for each of the subscales.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF AVL SUBSCALES (N=38)

	THEORETICAL	ECONOMIC	AESTHETIC	SOCIAL	POLITICAL	RELIGIOUS
MEAN	37.00	38.55	45.13	43.05	39.32	36.87
S.D.	5.53	6.95	9.33	8.00	5.17	7.91

All of the scales were administered in their entirety, with the exception of the College Student Questionnaire, due to the limited time for testing. From the original version of "Section IV-Attitudes" of the College Student Questionnaire, twenty-nine of forty items from four subscales were chosen for inclusion in

this test battery. The investigators felt that these items reflected issues which were not only of concern to the subjects, but also issues about which roommates would be likely to be aware of one another's views.

The reliability of the selected items was determined by using a Kuder-Richardson formula.[17] Table IV lists the reliability estimates calculated for all respondents on each of the subscales. With the exception of the Liberlaism Subscale, the reliabilities of the subscales were similar to those reported in the technical manual.[18] Because of its low reliability, the Liberalism Subscale has been eliminated from subsequent analyses and discussion.

TABLE IV

RELIABILITY ESTIMATES AND NUMBER OF ITEMS FOR FOUR CSQ SUBSCALES (N=42)

	FAMILY INDEPENDENCE	PEER INDEPENDENCE	SOCIAL CONSCIENCE	LIBERALISM
# OF ITEMS	8	6	8	7
RELIABILITY	.64	.65	.68	.07

Subjects' scores on the Mach IV and Mach V Scales were significantly correlated ($r=.683$, $p<.001$). This correlation is comparable to those reported by Christie and Geis.[19] In subsequent analyses, however, according to convention, total scores for the Mach Scales were used in order to permit comparison with other research on Machiavellianism. No analysis of the reliability of the Mach Scales was undertaken. Split-half reliability coefficients typically average in the .60's or .70's in various college samples throughout the country, including the University of

Delaware.[20] Means and standard deviations of the total sample on the Mach Scales are presented in Table V.

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF SCORES ON THE MACH SCALES (N=42)

	MACH IV	MACH V	TOTAL
MEAN	71.02	81.93	152.52
S.D.	13.21	9.38	21.39

Tests of the Hypotheses

The first hypothesis stated that there would be a significant positive relationship between pair members in the social background variables of age, year in college, and major. For age and year in college, the computed Kendall taus for all twenty-one pairs were respectively .42 ($p < .004$) and .94 ($p < .001$). However, due to the restricted possible variation caused by the sample selection procedure, these results provide little support for the Kerckhoff and Davis interpretation.

The predicted similarity does not occur in the case of college major, even though the possible variation was not restricted by the sample selection procedure. Rather than the pairs being characterized by similarity in majors, the Binomial test indicates near significance in the opposite direction ($x=6$, $N=9$, $p \leq .084$). Table VI indicates that only six of the nineteen pairs reporting majors had the same ones.

TABLE VI

SIMILARITY IN MAJORS OF PAIR MEMBERS (N=19)

PAIR #	MAJOR OF MEMBER #1	MAJOR OF MEMBER #2	SIMILARITY YES	SIMILARITY NO
1	Education	Nursing		X
2	Education	Education	X	
3	Education	Education	X	
4	Education	Medical Technology		X
5	Textiles and Clothing	Textiles and Clothing	X	
6	Statistics and Computer Science	Math		X
7	Education	Home Economics		X
8	Biology	Nursing		X
9	Education	Textiles and Clothing		X
10	Nursing	Education		X
11	English	Sociology		X
12	English	Education		X
13	Art	Child Development		X
14	English	International Relations		X
15	Education	Textiles and Clothing		X
17	Education	German		X
18	Education	Education	X	
19	Education	Education	X	
21	Education	Education	X	
		N=	6	13

If the Majors are reclassified on the basis of administrative division, or similar university requirements for particular majors, only pair #6 changes from lack of similarity in major to similarity in major. Thus only seven of the nineteen pairs would have similar majors. Once again, rather than the pairs being characterized by similarity in majors, the Binomial test indicates that the pairs were not significantly similar ($x=7$, $N=19$, $p \leq .130$).

Part a of the second hypothesis, which predicted significant similarity in values between roommates, was tested by computing taus between pair members on each of the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. These findings have been reproduced in Table VII.

TABLE VII

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF ROOMMATE PAIRS ON AVL SUBSCALES (N=19)

	THEORETICAL	ECONOMIC	AESTHETIC	SOCIAL	POLITICAL	RELIGIOUS
tau	.09	.34*	.28*	.28*	.14	.08

* $p < .05$

Part b of the second hypothesis, which posited significant similarity in attitudes between pair members, was also tested by computing taus between roommates on each of the subscales of the College Student Questionnaire. These results have been depicted in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF ROOMMATE PAIRS ON CSQ SUBSCALES (N=21)

	FAMILY INDEPENDENCE	PEER INDEPENDENCE	SOCIAL CONSCIENCE
tau	.15	.28*	.40*

* $p < .05$

The two preceding tables (VII and VIII) indicate that the roommate pairs were similar on three of the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values and on two of the three subscales of the College Student Questionnaire. These mixed results provide only partial support for the Kerckhoff and Davis formulation.

According to their findings, only "long-term relationships" were characterized by need complementarity. In the present setting, only pairs having long-term relationships were studied and the personality dimension of Machiavellianism was used as the criterion of need complementarity among the pairs. The hypothesis stipulated that there be a predominance of complementary

roommate pairs in the sample. The initial step was to obtain the median (155) of the distribution of total Mach scores. Then, all roommate pairs were classified as "complementary" or"similar." The former were those in which one member of each pair scored above the median and the other member of each pair scored below the median. The latter were those in which both members of each pair scored either above or below the median. Thus, similar pairs might consist either of two high Machs or of two low Machs. Using this method of classification, there were twelve complementary pairs and nine similar pairs.

The null hypothesis is that the proportion of complementary pairs = the proportion of similar pairs = one-half. The alternative hypothesis is that the number of complementary pairs is significantly greater than the number of similar pairs. Using the Binomial test, when x=9, and N=19, the associated $p < .50$, and therefore, the null hypothesis must be accepted. In sum, the number of complementary pairs does not predominate to a significant degree in this sample; and as a result of this finding, the Kerckhoff and Davis prediction has not been supported.

Despite the fact that complementary pairs do not predominate to a significant extent in the sample as hypothesized, among the twelve complementary pairs, there may be similarity in social background variables, values and attitudes, as the Kerckhoff and Davis model suggests. Since declared major was previously established as the best available social background variable, it is the only one considered in this context. Of the twelve pairs, only ten provided information about their majors. Whether analyzed

by academic department, or by the broader classification adopted above, there were only two complementary pairs with the same major. The Binomial test ($x=2$, $N=10$, $p \leq .055$) indicates that these findings are significantly opposite to the hypothesis.

In order to test a part of the second hypothesis using the complementary pairs, taus were computed between pair members on the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. As summarized in Table IX, the pairs were significantly similar on only two of the six subscales.

TABLE IX

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF COMPLEMENTARY ROOMMATE PAIRS ON AVL SUBSCALES (N=12)

	THEORETICAL	ECONOMIC	AESTHETIC	SOCIAL	POLITICAL	RELIGIOUS
tau	.17	.41*	.20	.13	.08	.48*
*p < .05						

In order to test part b of the second hypothesis, again using only the complementary pairs, taus were computed between pair members on three subscales of the College Student Questionnaire. Table X indicates that they were significantly similar on two of the three subscales.

TABLE X

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF COMPLEMENTARY ROOMMATE PAIRS ON CSG SUBSCALES (N=12)

	FAMILY INDEPENDENCE	PEER INDEPENDENCE	SOCIAL CONSCIENCE
tau	.46*	.11	.36*
*p < .05			

The two preceding tables (IX and X) demonstrate that the twelve complementary pairs were significantly similar on only two of the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study

of Values and on two of the three subscales of the College Student Questionnaire. These findings provide limited support for the Kerckhoff and Davis interpretation.

In contrast, an examination of the pattern of relationships obtained for the similar pairs reveals even less support for their model. It would predict more similarities among complementary than similar pairs. In the case of majors, four of the nine similar pairs had the same majors. The Binomial test ($x=4$, $N=9$, $p \leq .05$) indicates that there is no significant similarity or difference. With regard to the College Student Questionnaire, taus computed for the nine similar pairs on three subscales indicate two significant relationships: Peer Independence ($tau=.47$, $p < .05$) and Social Conscience ($tau=.49$, $p < .05$) Social Conscience and Family Independence produced significant correlations for complementary pairs. An even more striking contrast is revealed by an analysis of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values data; none of the relationships obtained on the six subscales was significant for the seven pairs. However, two of the correlations obtained for the complementary pairs were significant. Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that complementary pairs are more similar in values and attitudes than similar pairs. Unfortunately, the number of cases is so small that this finding can only be suggestive.

Another method of classifying the pairs was applied in order to overcome the problem of pair members' scores which clustered around the median. These would have been designated as complementary pairs, when, in fact, very little complementar-

ity or difference may have been present. In the alternative approach, difference scores between the total Mach scores of all pair members were calculated, and from these, a median (15) of the difference scores was obtained. Thus, all pairs above the median were redifined as similar. Table XI shows that eleven of the pairs previously classified are now in the opposite category, even though the actual distribution of complementary and similar pairs is not affected.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS OF CLASSIFYING PAIRS ON THE BASIS OF MACH SCORES (N=21)

PAIR #	MEMBER #1	MEMBER #2	MEDIAN SPLIT Complementary	MEDIAN SPLIT Similar	MEDIAN OF DIFFERENCE Complimentary	MEDIAN OF DIFFERENCE Similar
1	98	165	X		X	
2	143	124		X	X	
3	164	194		X	X	
4	117	166	X		X	
5	163	174		X		X
6	162	169		X		X
7	152	156	X			X
8	160	124	X		X	
9	153	157	X			X
10	142	130		X		X
11	156	153	X			X
12	182	140	X		X	
13	159	154	X			X
14	192	164		X	X	
15	132	147		X	X	
16	121	178	X		X	
17	119	142		X	X	
18	156	152	X			X
19	170	138	X		X	
20	180	143	X		X	
21	174	166		X		X
		N=	12	9	12	9

Using the median of difference as the basis for classification, analysis of majors among the ten complementary pairs reveals that only three of them have similar majors. The Binomial

test (x=3, N=10, $p \leq .172$) indicates that the results are again significantly opposite to the hypothesis.

In order to determine whether or not significant relationships existed among the complementary pairs on the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, taus were computed. Table XII shows that significant correlations again occurred for only two of the six subscales.

TABLE XII

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF COMPLEMENTARY ROOMMATE PAIRS ON AVL SUBSCALES (N=11)

	THEORETICAL	ECONOMIC	AESTHETIC	SOCIAL	POLITICAL	RELIGIOUS
tau	.22	.49*	.46*	.11	-.03	.22
* $p < .05$						

Taus were also computed for the complementary pairs on three subscales of the College Student Questionnaire. Table XIII shows that a significant relationship occurred for only one subscale. In the previous analysis, two significant relationships were found.

TABLE XIII

RANK CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF COMPLEMENTARY ROOMMATE PAIRS ON CSQ SUBSCALES (N=12)

	FAMILY INDEPENDENCE	PEER INDEPENDENCE	SOCIAL CONSCIENCE
tau	.25	.22	.48*
*$p < .05$			

With regard to the similar pairs, the predictions of the Kerckhoff and Davis model are again unsupported. In terms of major, three of the nine pairs had similar ones. The Binomial test (x=3, N=9, $p \leq .254$) indicates that the hypothesis is not confirmed. Computed taus between members of eight similar

roommate pairs prodiced no significant relationships for the six subscales of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values. The same procedure, performed for the three subscales of the College Student Questionnaire, using nine pairs, produced only one significant correlation: Peer Independence, .55, $p < .05$. Thus, it can be seen that these data do not support the predictions based on the Kerckhoff and Davis model.

In order to test the third and fourth hypotheses, which dealt with the tendency to assume similarity and the ability to perceive accurately, data from the College Student Questionnaire (Forms I and II) were analyzed. Two sets of measures were derived from these data for high and low Machs:

A. Measures of Accuracy

1. the number of cases in which actual similarity existed and respondents accurately indicated it (Actual Similarity Accuracy)

2. the number of cases in which actual difference existed and respondents accurately indicated it (Actual Difference Accuracy)

B. Measures of Inaccuracy

3. the number of cases in which actual difference existed and respondents inaccurately indicated similarity (Assumed Similarity)

4. the number of cases in which actual similarity existed and respondents inaccurately indicated difference (Assumed Difference)

Means for high and low Machs were determined, and then, t-tests were performed. The results appear in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW MACHIAVELLIANS' ACCURACY AND INACCURACY OF PERCEPTION

	MEASURES OF ACCURACY: ACTUAL SIMILARITY	ACTUAL DIFFERENCE	MEASURES OF INACCURACY: ASSUMED SIMILARITY	ASSUMED DIFFERENCE
HIGH MACH X (N=22)	.38	.38	.41	.42
LOW MACH X (N=20)	.66	.26	.51	.30
t (one-tailed)	.01	3.21*	-1.89**	2.71*

*P < .005 **P < .05

The first measure, Actual Similarity Accuracy, does not produce any significant difference between high and low Machs, as expected, because the low Machs' seeming accuracy is greatly increased by their tendency to assume similarity. The remaining measures prove that this is indeed the case. In terms of Actual Difference Accuracy, the high Machs are significantly more accurate than the low Machs, as was predicted. With regard to Assumed Similarity, the third measure indicates that low Machs tend to assume significantly more similarity (unwarranted) than do high Machs, as was hypothesized. On the last measure, Assumed Difference, the high Machs are significantly more likely than the low Machs to assume difference, which enhances the probability to their being more accurate. In sum, both the third and fourth Hypotheses were confirmed.

Conclusion

A study has been carried out which investigates the social background factors, attitudes, and personality of twenty-one female college student roommate pairs. The study attempts to test hypotheses derived from an earlier study of interpersonal attraction by Kerckhoff and Davis.

It was found that none of the hypotheses related to similarity in social background factors and/or attitudes and values or complementarity in personality was supported by the data obtained. The Kerckhoff and Davis model posited a three-stage process of interpersonal attraction, culminating in need-complementarity, based upon realistic assessment of the other. The personality variable used in this study was that of Machiavellianism, which has been previously established as having a significant relationship to differential ability to perceive accurately and to differential tendency to assume similarity. It has been pointed out above that Kerckhoff and Davis did not consider these possibilities. The two hypotheses about Machiavellian personality traits and perception have been fully confirmed.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lee G. Burchinal, "The Premarital Dyad and Love Involvement," in Harold T. Christensen (ed.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family (New York: Rand-Mcnally, 1964), P. 646; C.E. Bowerman, "Assortive Mating by Previous Marital Statue: Seattle, 1939-1946," American Sociological Review, 1953, 18, 170-177; C.E. Bowerman, "Age Relationships at Marriage, by Marital Status and Age at Marriage," Marriage and Family Living, 1956, 18, 231-233; L.G. Burchinal and L.E. Chancellor, "Ages at Marriage, Occupations of Grooms and Interreligious Marriage Rates," Social Forces, 1962, 40, 348-354; L.G. Burchinal and L.E. Chancellor, "Social Status, Religious Affiliation and Ages at Marriage," Marrigae and Family Living, 1963, 25, 219-221; E.W. Burgess and P. Wallin, "Homogamy in Social Characteristics," American Journal of Sociology, 1943, 49, 109-124; J. Burma, "Research Note on the Measurement of Interracial Marriages," American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 57, 587-589; R. Centers, "Marital Selection and Occupational Strata," American Journal Of Sociology, 1949, 54, 530-535; F.A. Cizon, "Interethnic and Interreligious Marriage Patterns in Parish X," American Catholic Sociological Review, 1954, 15, 244-255; P.C. Glick, "Intermarriage and Fertility Patterns Among Persons in Major Religious Groups," Eugenics Quarterly, 1960, 7, 31-38; P.C. Glick and E. Landau, " Age as a Factor in Marriage," American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 517-529; J. Golden, "Characteristics of the Negro-White Intermarried in Philadelphia," American Sociological Review, 1953, 18, 177-183; J. Golden, "Patterns of Negro-White Intermarriage," American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 144-147; J.S. Heiss, "Premarital Characteristics of the Religiously Intermarried in an Urban Area," American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 47-55; A.B. Hollingshed, "Cultural Factors in Mate Selection," American Sociological Review, 1950, 15, 619-627; A.B. Hollingshed, "Age Relationships and Marriage," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 492-499; T.C. Hunt, "Occupational Status and Marriage Selection," American Sociological Review, 1940, 5, 495-504; H.J. Locke, G. Sabagh, and M.M. Thomes, "Interfaith Marriages," Social Problems, 1957, 4, 329-333; A.P. Sundal and T.C. McCormick, "Age at Marriage and Mate Selection, Madison, Wisconsin, 1937-1943," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 37-48; J.L. Thomas, "The Factor of Religion in Selection of Marriage Mates," American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 487-491; J.L. Thomas, "Out-Group Marriage Patterns of Some Selected Ethini Groups," American Catholic Sociological Review, 1954, 15, 9-18.

2. E.W. Burgess and P. Wallin, "Homogamy in Personal Characteristics," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1944, 29, 475-481; D. Byrne, "Interpersonal Attraction and Attitude Similarity," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715; D. Byrne and B. Blaylock, "Similarity and Assumed Similarity of AttitudesBetween Husbands and Wives,"

Journal of Adnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 636-640: G. Levinger and J. Breedlove, "Interpersonal Attraction and Agreement, a Study of Marriage Partners, "1966,3, 367-372: G. Lindzey and E.F. Borgatta, "Sociometric Measurement, "in G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol. 1, Theory and Method (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954), 405-448; T.M. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961); J.A. Schellenberg, "Homogamy in Personal Values and the Field of Eligibles," Social Forces, 1960, 39, 157-162.

3. E.G. Beier, A.M. Kossi, and R.L. Garfield, "Similarity Plus Dissimilarity of Personality: Basis for Friendship?", Psychological Reports, 1961, 8, 3-8; J.A. Broxton, "A Test of Interpersonal Attraction Predictions Derived From Balance Theory," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 63, 394-397; E.W. Burgess and P. Wallin, "Homogamy in Personal Characteristics," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1944, 29, 475-481; R.B. Cattell and J.B. Nesselroade, "Likeness and Completeness Theories Examined by 16 Personality Factor Measures on Stably and Unstably Married Couples," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 351-361; C.E. Izard (a). "Personality Similarity, Positive Affect, and Interpersonal Attraction,"Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61 484-485; C.E. Izard (b), "Personality Similarity and Friendship,"Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51; C.E. Izard,"Personality Similarity and Friendship: A Follow-Up Study," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 598-600; N. Miller, D.T. Campbell, H. Twedt, and E.J. O'Connell, "Similarity, Contrast, and Complementarity in Friendship Choice, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 3-12; N. Reader and H.B. English, "Personality Factors in Adolescent Female Friendships,"Cons. Psych., 1947, 11, 212-220.

4. Ellen Berscheid and Elaine H. Walster, Interpersonal Attraction (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Weslsy, 1969, p. 78.

5. T. Ktsanes, "Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A Study Utilizing an Empirical Typology of Personality; American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 547-551; T.M. Newcomb, "The Prediction of Interpersonal Attraction, "American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586; T.M. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961); D.E. Roos, "Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: A Study Based on R-typeFactor Analysis, "Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956; R.F. Winch (a), "The Theory of complementary Needs in Mate Selection: A Test of One Kind of Complementariness," American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 52-56; R.F. Winch (b), "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: Final Results on the Test of the General Hypothesis, "American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 552-555 R.F. Winch, T. Ktsanes, and V. Ktsanes, "Empirical Elaboration of the Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 51, 508-513;

FOOTNOTES (CONT'D)

R.F. Winch, T. Ktsanes, and V. Ktsanes, "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection. An Analytic and Descriptive Study, "American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 241-249

6. T.J. Banta and M. Hetherington, "Relations Between Needs of Friends and Fiancees, " Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 401-404; G. Becker, "The Complementarity Need Hypothesis: Authoritarianism, Dominance, and Other Edwards Personality Preference Schedule Scores, "Journal of Personality, 1964, 32, 45-56; C.E. Bowerman and B.R. Day, "A Test of the Theory of Complementary Needs as Applied to Couples During Courtship, "American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 602-605; I. Katz, S. Glucksberg, and R. Krauss, "Need Satisfaction and Edwards PPS Scores in Married Couples, " J. Cons. Psych., 1960, 24, 203-208; B.I. Murstein, "A Complementary Need Hypothsis in Newlyweds and Middle-Aged Married Couples," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 194-197; J.A. Schellenberg and L.S. Bee, "A Re-Examination of the Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection, "Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 227-232.

7. G. Levinger, "Note on Need Complementarity in Marriage", Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 61, 153-157; I. Rosos. "Issues in the Concept of Need-Complementarity,"Sociometry, 1957, 20, 216-233.

8. A.C. Kerckhoff and K.E. Davis, "Value-Consensus and Need Complementarity in Mate Selection,"American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.

9. D. Byrne and B. Blaylock, "Similarity and Assumed Similarity of Attitudes Between Husbands and Wives, "Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 636-640; G. Levinger and J. Breedlove, "Interpersonal Attraction and Agreement; A Study of Marriage Partners, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 367-372; T.M. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process, op cit.

10. T.M. Newcomb, The Acquaintance Process, op cit.

11. R. Christie and F.L. Geis, Studies in Machiavellianism (New York: Academic Press, 1970).

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. I. Rosow, "Issues in the Concept of Need-Complementarity," op cit.

15. T. Ktsanes, "Mate Selection on the Basis of Personality Type: A Study Utilizing an Empirical Typology of Personality, " op cit.

FOOTNOTES (CONT'D)

16. R. Christie and F.L. Geis: Studies in Machivellianism, op cit

17. G.F. Kuder and M.W. Richardson, "The Theory and Estimation of Test Reliability, "Psychometrika, 1937, 2, 151-160: G.A. Ferguson, "A Note on the Kuder-Richardson Formula, " Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1951, 11, 612-615.

18. Educational Testing Service Manual for The College Student Questionnaires, (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968), p. 27.

19. R. Christie and F.L. Geis, Students in Machiavelliamism, op cit.

20. Personal Communication, F.L. Geis, August, 1972.